UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Note on College Student Religion - - - - - - - *Walker H. Hill*

Concerning Jesus - - *Jesse H. Holmes*

As to Man - - *Robert Scott Kellerman*

Religion, Race, and Cultural Pluralism - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Mathematics for the Million - *May Stranathan*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 4

Chicago, April 18, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN, FRED HANKINSON, REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL, ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 51
Jottings—J. H. H. 53

ARTICLES—
A Note on College Student Religion—WALKER H. HILL 54
Concerning Jesus—JESSE H. HOLMES 56
As to Man—ROBERT SCOTT KELLERMAN 57
Religion, Race, and Cultural Pluralism—VICTOR S. YARROS 59
Mathematics for the Million—MAY STRANATHAN 61

POETRY—
Sundays—ANNERIKA FRIES 64

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Divine Tragedy of the Prophet Jeremiah—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 62
Jews and Christians—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 63

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Voice from Australia—SYDNEY STRONG 64
Always Counts on UNITY—MRS. E. W. HARDY 64
Our Deepest Thanks!—O. C. S. 64

THE FIELD—
If We Had a League of Peoples—REGINALD REYNOLDS 50
Western Poets Congress—RALPH CHEYNEY 64

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

If We Had a League of Peoples

By Reginald Reynolds*

Not with a "reformed League" am I concerned, in which the fundamental principles of power politics would remain. I cannot regard these as compatible with peace, as I understand the word. The Labor Party in my own country and similar parties in other parts of the world have, as I see it, failed principally because they have accepted the advice which the Boyg gave to Peer Gynt: "Go round about." It is this treacherous philosophy which has continually led idealists to disaster; for all reformists who accept half-measures must sooner or later use powers of repression against those who demand more. Such is the history of all compromises with imperialism and war.

The problem is not simple. If on the one hand we can have no part in a "collective security" which merely secures the "have" powers against the "have-nots," so on the other hand we cannot lend our support to a so-called solution of war by handing colonies to Germany, Italy, and Japan as though their inhabitants were so many pieces of raw meat. We have to believe in the inalienable right of peoples to choose their own form of government. If this principle has any meaning, it applies not only to the peoples of Europe, but also to Bantus and Hottentots, Arabs and Indians.

The proposed League of Peoples would bear little resemblance to the present League. India is now represented by gentlemen appointed, not by Indians, but by their British rulers. In a League of Peoples, India would have its own delegation, for clearly it is absurd for Britain to appoint the Indian delegates, as it would be for Italy to appoint the delegates for Ethiopia. India has a population about eight times that of Britain and should rank in the counsels of the world rather as a continent than as a country. The same applies to a greater degree to China and in a less degree to Russia. But it is hardly fair that Europe should be rewarded for its uncivilized habits by giving to each one of its tribal states a status equal to that of a subcontinent.

In this new League, civilized ideas would at last dominate the discussions. No doubt the tribes of New Guinea would be represented there to teach Europeans how to reach an agreed decision without voting. South Africa would be represented by a delegation based on its population ratio—that is, four Negroes to one white man. These Negroes, and those from other former African colonies, would be able to

*The author is one of the outstanding and most intelligent leaders of the British peace movement. His latest book, *The White Sahib in India*, recently published in this country also, was widely acclaimed as a realistic study of British rule in India. It was barred in India by the British.

(*Continued on page* 63)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1938 No. 4

NONRESISTANCE

"Priest: 'My Lord, these are not men, these come not as men come, but
Like maddened beasts. They come not like men, who
Respect the sanctuary, who kneel to the Body of Christ,
But like beasts. You would bar the door
Against the lion, the leopard, the wolf or the boar,
Why not more
Against beasts with the souls of damned men, against men
Who would damn themselves to beasts? My Lord! My Lord!'
"Thomas A. Becket: 'Unbar the door!
You think me reckless, desperate, and mad. . . .
We are not here to triumph by fighting, by stratagem, or by resistance,
Not to fight with beasts as men. We have fought the beast
And have conquered. We have only to conquer
Now by suffering. This is the easier victory.'"

T. S. Eliot, *Murder in the Cathedral.*

CONFUSION WORSE CONFOUNDED

Appalling is the disorder prevailing these days in Washington. In an hour when the nation is slipping into an economic debâcle which threatens momentarily to equal the vast collapse of 1929, and the international situation lowers ever more terribly on the horizons of the world, our statesmen seem to be almost hopelessly lost in personal contention, partisan bickering, and confusion worse confounded. It would seem as though the time had come to rally around the President once again, and thus mobilize the united sentiment of the people. But, alas the President is no such rallying-ground as he once was. Steadily his support is dropping away as more and more people come to realize that the New Deal has accomplished nothing, since in its very conception, to say nothing of its wild-cat administration, it was unsound. An attempt, however well-intentioned in purpose and motive, to destroy abundance and distribute scarcity, to raise the price level and therewith impoverish the people, to stem the tide of unemployment by damming it up behind an artificial barrier of spending, certain in the end to break and release the flood anew—all this was sure to fail, as Unity alone among liberal journals insisted from the beginning. The people have lost confidence in presidential leadership. The regular polls of the American Institute of Public Opinion—the so-called Gallup poll—show an uninterrupted drop in popular support which prophesies accurately and ominously for the future. In addition there is the fact of the President's apparent loss of confidence in himself. He is no longer stirring the country, as in those inspiring opening months of his first administration. There are no more "fireside chats." That ready art of improvization for meeting the chances and changes of a public crisis has now lapsed into an inaction, an irritation, a sullen stubbornness of mood, which leaves the government to flap around like a ship hung in the wind. At the hour of its greatest need, democracy in this country is not functioning. President, Congress, and people are in confusion and dismay, and, having nothing definite to do, fight peevishly and pettily among themselves. It's a sorry spectacle!

SALVAGE

Out of the confusion noted above something must be saved, if the nation is to endure at all. What that something is we believe is obvious—namely, the fine impulse of the President, undimmed by mistaken ways and means, to bring to bear the forces of government to serve the needs of the helpless and well-nigh hopeless myriads of the common people. The President's reiterated reminder, most recently in his Gainesville speech, of the "one-third of the nation ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed," is an incomparable contribution to the nation's thought. From the beginning the plight of this miserable one-third of our people has rested as a burden upon Mr. Roosevelt's mind, and he has wisely insisted that this burden be shared by the public conscience. The result is that we are aware today of this submerged mass of the population as never before. "Ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed!" How the phrase haunts us! Why should any family, any individual, in this bounteous land have not enough to eat? How can we explain, much less justify, any mortal going cold, or in rags, either in our rich cities or on our fertile countryside? As for housing, why should not every human being among us have a decent home? The fact is, in our struggles for wealth, we have forgotten one another. But Mr. Roosevelt is reminding us—and never again can we forget! What America is easily able to do, and must do, is to establish a standard of happy and abundant life which shall be for all the people. It is to the Presi-

dent's credit that the New Deal, whatever its perversities and misconceptions, its faults and failures, has been inspired by this motive and ideal. And let this be said! —that what the New Deal has not done, because of its own inner errors, must yet be done. Any idea that we are going back to "normalcy," after this experience of what "normalcy" leads to, is ridiculous. Out of the present wreckage we are going to salvage good intentions, high purpose, a true objective, and through genuinely progressive statesmanship produce a social order in which the ill-fed will be *fed,* the ill-clothed *clothed,* and the ill-housed *housed.*

THE ROAD OF EXILE

We salute the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in admiration of and gratitude for their invitation to twenty-nine nations of the world to meet the problem of the exiles now wandering over the earth. Nothing in all his public career more honorably becomes the man and the official than this action of Mr. Roosevelt in seeking to find refuge for the millions now homeless, poverty-stricken, and afraid. The magnitude and pity of the problem are admirably stated by Miss Dorothy Thompson in the current issue of *Foreign Affairs:*

> Already there are some 4,000,000 people in the world who are "men without a country." The list is by no means exclusively Jewish. . . The twentieth century revolutions have set loose an unprecedented migration which includes people of every race and every social class, every trade and every profession . . . monarchists in republics and republicans in monarchies; priests and radicals; artists and laborers; capitalists and anti-capitalists . . . nonconformists of every race and every social, religious and political viewpoint. The possibility that this number is to be augmented within the immediate future is undeniable.

Before Miss Thompson's article could find its way into print, "the possibility" of which she spoke had become a reality. The hundreds of thousands of Jews and anti-Nazis in Austria had been added to the swelling flood of human misery. Mr. Roosevelt's plan is admirably conceived—as wise in outline as it is compassionate in spirit. He envisages the setting up of an international body, similar to the High Commission for German Refugees organized by the League of Nations in 1933, to lend succor to exiles pouring in from Germany, Austria, Italy, Russia, and other nations. The task of this body would have to be defined by the mandate committed to it by the international conference suggested by the President. Primary, of course, is the business of providing funds for the support of refugees who have been stripped of their property and are thus penniless. To support these people, transport them to their new homes, sustain them until they are established in their new life—this is basic, and will be made effective through the coöperation of private relief agencies. More difficult is the problem of finding lands in which these refugees may settle. The President has indicated clearly that he does not intend to ask Congress to suspend or extend our quota regulations. Other countries may hardly be expected to do what the United States is not willing to do. But open doors must somewhere be found, and Mr. Roosevelt is taking the first and most effective step to this end in using his vast authority as President to bring the subject to the attention of mankind. Meanwhile, such selfish opposition as has appeared in this country is not to be taken seriously. It is discredited before it starts.

WHAT PROPAGANDA CAN DO!

A letter from Japan has come into our hands which we must share with our readers. We have seen no more impressive illustration of the influence of government in wartime upon the minds of its citizens. The writer of this letter is a highly intelligent and educated gentleman, executive director of an important social service organization. He has traveled widely, and has visited this country. In his letter to an American correspondent, he states:

> "I will write you real cause of Sino-Japanese trouble which occurred in August 1937, lest you should misapprehend the nature of the trouble. Sino-Japanese trouble was followed as an unavoidable consequence that Chiang Kai-Shek, the governor of China, had adopted the pro-Communist and anti-Japanese policy, and tyrannized on peoples to maintain his own position. As we Japanese, I believe, have vital concerns in China's welfare, Japanese government had to take decisive measures. This means Japanese army will destroy the faction of Chiang Kai-Shek and relieve Chinese people from oppression of military faction. These decisive measures are necessary, after all, for the welfare of China and Japana. . .
>
> "Conflict or war between countries is most undesirable and miserable thing for the mankind, but it will be an unavoidable step toward New World. . .
>
> "I hope you will assist me in clearing the misapprehension of peoples in your country about Japanese acts concerning Sino-Japanese trouble, as Japanese Government is attacking not civilization but military faction of China in the cause of justice to relieve four hundred millions of Chinese."

It seems incredible that intelligent Japanese can believe this stuff as handed out by their government. Incredible—until we remember that this was just what we were made to believe, and *did* believe, in 1917 when we went to war against Germany! And it will be just this again which we will believe when we take up arms in the coming imperialistic war. As a matter of fact, under the propaganda influence of Washington at this moment, we are already taking precisely this viewpoint in the interest of the new armament and the next war. So we can understand the Japanese gentleman perfectly!

NAZARETH IN AMERICA

Most Americans are familiar with Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, if only because of the ghastly anomaly of the center of the American armament industry being located in a town named after the birthplace of the Prince of Peace. The corresponding town of Nazareth, Pennsylvania, is not so familiar, but it is coming into the news in connection with plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the community in

1940. When John Wesley came to this country, he met on shipboard a group of Moravians bound for a new home on the new continent. These Moravians found their way to William Penn's Quaker commonwealth, and some of them settled in what they chose to call after Jesus' childhood home in Palestine. Now, in commemoration of this founding of their town, the present-day inhabitants are planning to do a significant thing—namely, remove from the public square, in front of the old Moravian church, an ancient cannon which has long cumbered up the place. These modern Nazarenes have come to the conclusion that this cannon is "highly inappropriate" as a symbol of their pacifist "founding fathers." So out it goes! Would that other townspeople in other communities, with or without such a heritage, might do the same! Away with the cannon, ancient and modern, which desecrate full many a public square, and common, and even graveyard! Put them on the scrapheap, and let them rust and rot. Then take down ninety per cent of the soldiers' monuments in this country! Ninety-five per cent ought to be removed from the public gaze, if only for aesthetic reasons. Were there ever in any age such rock piles of bad taste? But some of them depict sound sentiment, or are at least unoffending. As for the prevailing horrors of bayonet-charging soldiers and cannon-ramming sailors, or military figures standing at salute or at rest, all glorifying war and participation in war, let them be torn down and trampled under foot! Then let us go into the churches, and tackle their memorial windows and tablets that commemorate the dead in war, as though these were peculiarly and particularly the holy dead. War will never be ended until it is plucked out of men's hearts, and given over not to blessing but to damnation. Nazareth, Pennsylvania, has set a good example. "Go thou, and do likewise!"

THE MAN OF MYSTERY

The late Col. Edward M. House was a man of mystery. There is no understanding of what he was or what he really did in a momentous period of human history. His letters and papers have in large volume been published, yet they seem to explain nothing. His goings and comings for six or seven years upon the vast stage of world events have all been clearly traced, but the picture disclosed is that of a ghost flitting restlessly in the midst of shadows. What was the secret of the Wilson-House friendship? Nobody knows. Why was that friendship so suddenly ended? Vague surmises have led only to uncertain speculations. What did Col. House accomplish during the Great War? Some say his busy influence was good, some that it was bad, some that it was merely futile. What part did he play in the shaping of the Versailles Treaty? We hope that it was a small part but nobody can say. "A passion for anonymity," as it has been called, was so pretentious as to become an affectation, or even conceit, of the first order, and resulted in a mystery taking on a character of momentousness that made Col. House, in our humble judgment, seem to be vastly more important than he ever really was. What we have felt about this man is what we believe will eventually be confirmed by posterity —that he was an innocent moving about great centers of influence with an enormous sense of self-importance, and pitifully used by men infinitely shrewder than himself to accomplish their own sinister and deliberate purposes. That he ever really knew what it was all about in those dreadful war-days, or ever did anything but allow himself to be naively fooled into bringing America into the conflict, we believe history has yet to prove. What we need to learn from this strange episode is that the man of mystery is not necessarily by any means the man of power. Our first suspicion is that the mysterious man is the awesome man. But more likely is it that the man who works behind closed doors and walks in the shadows is the man who dares not expose himself to the open air and the bright sunshine, lest his real stature be seen. At any rate, in a democracy, we think it a good thing for all important men to carry on their activities in public, and to be made to submit themselves and their policies to the judgment of their fellow citizens.

Jottings

It has never seemed possible that anything could be worse than "jazz," but now the worst has arrived in the form of "swing." And "swing" is so popular with radio fans that Station WNEW in New York is broadcasting a special "swing session" on Sunday mornings from 11 o'clock to 12. This used to be the church hour on radio and elsewhere!

"Femininity, coquetry, and romance" were the dominant notes in the new women's styles shown in recent fashion shows in New York. It's sporting to make this announcement right out in public and thus give the men a chance to get away in time.

Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, of St. Nicholas Church, New York, refers to the famous Bolshevik slogan, "Religion is the opiate of the people," and remarks sagely that he "sometimes wonders if there is religion enough in the world to drug anybody." Why haven't any of us thought of that before?

We have more than once asserted that war could not be more or less humane, since it is itself wholly inhumane. That's good logic! But Generalissimo Franco has taught us in his bombing of civilians in Madrid and Barcelona that it is possible to have in war gradations of inhumaneness. Dante found descending circles in hell. So Franco is descending into the hell of war, and has now reached the nethermost confines of the infernal.

"What desolations he hath made in the earth."
—*Psalm* 46.

Yes, God has made some pretty good ones, though man can now outdo the best volcanoes and earthquakes in stock. But the Psalm goes on to say that God "maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth." Which is certainly more than man can do! God is indeed great, and his power from everlasting to everlasting.

Persons who have one idea are like mothers who have one child. They are inclined to exaggerate its uniqueness and importance.

J. H. H.

A Note on College Student Religion

WALKER H. HILL

What is the attitude of young people in college toward religion? The question has been the subject of constant battling. Alarmists have charged the colleges with the crime of destroying religious faith in their students. College authorities have denied the charge, citing statistics on the membership of students in churches and other organizations of a religious nature.

It may be doubted that such charges and such citations furnish much real information on the question at issue. Leaving aside the matter of responsibility for the attitudes students take, we need to inquire further if we are to have any accurate notion of what those attitudes are. There may be any number of reasons for an individual's membership in a church or in a student religious group. It shows that, for some reason, he is interested in the organization. But this membership, or the lack of it, does not indicate what religion means to a person.

It would be difficult, indeed, to get an accurate answer to this question even by asking students. Suppose we should give a questionnaire, or assign a theme, asking: What does religion mean to you? What part do you see it playing, and what part do you think it *should* play, in the affairs of contemporary life? What does it contribute to the solution of problems of human living? The answers would be informative, certainly. But they would conceal a great deal as well. They would be colored by the suggestions inevitably conveyed in the statement of the question. Then, too, students are apt to be wary of such a question. Their account of what they think about it would be distorted considerably by their notion of what they ought to think or of what they are expected to think.

The questions suggested just now as the substance of a questionnaire are the questions I believe we should like to have answered if we are concerned about the student's view of religion—even if a questionnaire will not give the answers. They ask what we want to know. If we could have a set of spontaneous, unadorned answers to these questions, from a large and representative group of students, I have no doubt that it would be illuminating.

The opinions discussed in the following pages come very near, I think, to meeting the desired qualifications. They give the answers to our questions, and give them accurately as far as one group of students is concerned. This group may not be large enough to speak for all college students, but it may be confidently said that these students are telling what they really think.

We have these frank opinions as the result of a happy accident. They appeared where no one had deliberately sought them, when no one had asked the questions which they answered.

In the final examination for a course in "Philosophy and the Human Enterprise" in June, 1937, some 220 students of the University of Wisconsin were given this question: "What problems for man are created by the impact of science upon society?" Following the question was a short list of suggested plans for solution of the problems. The students were asked to discuss critically all the suggestions, to take a position in regard to them and give reasons for the position taken.

One of the suggestions read as follows: "Permit science to go its own way, and take care of the situation by giving a central place in life to religion." It may not be surprising that very few regarded this as an adequate way of meeting the problem; though, to be sure, some of them did. What is interesting is the way the discussion of this suggestion showed very clearly, in most cases, the student's conception of the meaning and rôle of religion. It was revealed with a degree of candor that, as I have suggested, one could not hope to find if the question were put explicitly.

Eliminating those papers which are not informative on this subject, we have as our data 185 expressions of opinion on the significance of religion. It is possible to divide them roughly into three groups.

There are those, not more than thirty-five in number, who have faith in religion as they know it. Religion, they say, should be a major concern of man. Life would be poor without it. The greater our devotion to religion, the better will the problems of life be met and solved. These writers have little interest in discussing what religion means. Their acceptance is in few cases critical. What

they mean, when they do tell us, is man's concern for his relation to a directing deity.

To these people religion is indispensable. They have unbounded respect for it. It may be significant, however, that some of them feel that their position is a lonely one. A young woman speaks for this portion of the group. In response to the suggestion, she says:

> No, this can't be done. Science can go its own way, but there are very few who will give religion a central place in life. I might as an individual agree with this, but from the experience I have had in many places—class, friends, etc.—I realize that religion takes either a back seat in their lives or else they don't believe anything about religion. Most people seem to think it is passing out of existence. Maybe it is. I hope it doesn't for me.

A second group, about equal in number to the first, is more critical of religion. These students, too, look to religion for guidance. They expect it to play a constructive rôle in the lives of men. But they are thinking of religion not only in terms of what it is; they are interested in what it may become. The term has a richness and flexibility for them; they want it to take on new meaning. We have not developed, they say, a religion adequate for our times. But we *might* develop it. They call for "a workable everyday type of religion which could handle contemporary problems of society." Let some of them speak for themselves:

> Religion needs reinterpretation if it is to be given an important place in life. It must be divested of its other-worldliness, its absolutes. We must realize that religion is for man, not man for religion.
>
> We must readjust science and religion to fit each other. How far we will have to break down religious ideas of the past is hard to tell, but it will have to come.
>
> A new philosophy, I think, will in time supplant the religion of yesterday and the religion of today, which is even now taking on new aspects.
>
> Religion, with some reorientation, can provide us with moral aspirations and hopes, while science can be a method whereby we discover ways and means in the universe of realizing these hopes.
>
> Due to the development of science, I think it is quite impossible to go back to religion as a central feature in life, especially the old-time supernatural religion. A modern religion to try to make people live a good, full, adequate life and help their fellow men to do so would be fine—if we get away from the *profit motive* which now is the central feature.
>
> For some, religion may take an equal rôle [with science] in some different, or perhaps just modified, form; and for others it may be just a method of conduct, a set of ideas or way of life with no supernatural or superhuman element in it.

These are typical opinions from this group. They look to religion hopefully. We must have religion, they tell us, but we must make it over to fit the realities of present-day life. Some of them express it not so confidently. We must have religion, as they put it, *if* we can make it over to function effectively. Almost unanimously they call for a religion that will concern itself with concrete problems of human living on a *naturalistic* ground.

The remaining group, more than half the total, looks at religion without hope. They see in it nothing vital or helpful for modern society. To them religion represents an outmoded superstition or a futile sentimentality, or an organization which hinders social progress. To make religion important in our life would be a "turning back"—the phrase occurs again and again. Religion has had its day; we have left it behind. They dismiss it with a snap of the fingers, sometimes with more vigorous gestures. Some of them do it reluctantly, others quite happily.

"Religion is out of my picture of life," says one student; "I am for science all over." "Should we attempt to make religion a dominant force in life," says another, "we would have to shift back to the middle ages in thought at least and forget altogether about the age we are now in."

Let us leave religion to people who are "intellectually or morally weak," another suggests. "If you are a theist," she goes on, "there is an offer of security, and that is one of the things man is looking for . . . To be secure in religion we must close our eyes to rationality and find our security in adherence to superstition. Can we?"

A few more samples express the general opinion of the group:

> Religion is too much interested in the spiritual side of life and does nothing to control the practical side. Religion is too passive to be an effective control on anything as dynamic as science.
>
> This would be just like throwing up the whole business of working and struggling for what one wants and just sitting down to hope and pray for it.

Some opinions are more extreme:

> And all become nuns, or monks, or ascetics! How would such a course of action settle anything—except that we admit we give up? We don't need more beliefs. We need more intelligence. Since when did religions dispense intelligence?
>
> Permit science to go its own way and remove the stupid, stagnating, inhibiting, clutching, hindering religion.

It is clear that these students are not without hope and enthusiasm for social readjustment, for a struggle to realize ideals. They feel the need for a better way of life. But it is to be achieved, in their view, without guidance or help from religion. On what, then, do they pin their faith? Let two of them answer:

> Orthodox religion is on its way out and the worship of the people has been transferred to science.
>
> Religion, of some sort, has had the central place in our life, and I'm a bit hard put to decide whether or not science isn't a religion. It seems to me that whatever it is we lean on, our crutch is our religion. We "believe" in something, we trust it, we *depend* on it. That's what I want. What we depend on is our religion, as I see it.

The answer to the problems created by science is—more science. Let science alone, some insist; it is our salvation. Extend the use of scientific method in the social studies, says the great majority; develop the social sciences. The two students just quoted express the view of many, explicitly stated by some, clearly read between the lines of others. To them, science is the new religion.

Our picture shows, then, one-fifth of our students satisfied that religion is an effective force in the life of our day. Another fifth feels that it can be made effective. Three-fifths are ready, or think they are, to give it up.

It may be pertinent to ask in what degree this is a representative college group. There was no selection of students; the course was open to all juniors and seniors until the limit of enrollment was reached. To the instructors this group seemed distinctive in one respect only: students electing this course appeared, in general, to be a little bit ahead of the average in alertness and breadth of interest. As to the possibility of professorial influ-

ence, the tone of the discussion relevant to this question was such that the students took it to be, though it was not intended to be, severely critical of science.

If it is true, or approximately true, that so large a proportion of forward-looking young men and women anticipate that religion will be left behind as they push on in life, can this be disregarded by religious leaders? These students, as we have seen, are genuinely interested in preserving values which religion has claimed as its own. But they feel that these values can no longer be associated with religion. Those whose concern it is to make religion a vital influence in modern life appear to be faced with a compelling challenge to meet this critical situation. Can they do so?

Concerning Jesus

JESSE H. HOLMES

It is a strange, strange thing that has happened to the story of Jesus. I wonder what this young Jewish workman would have thought if he could have foreseen that he, the champion of the poor and oppressed—to whom the learned Sadducees were little more than a name, and the respectable Pharisees were despicable hypocrites—should one day be the bulwark of the classes he distrusted and the central figure of an institution which has grasped at wealth and power for a thousand years.

What do we know of Jesus? "Knowing" anything in the past is attained from a kind of proportion of evidence and probability: probable things may be believed on little evidence; improbable things require more and more as they are more and more unlikely. How about our sources for the life and death of Jesus? The gospels, of course, and not much else. There seem to have been two important originals: a possible contemporary collection of Jesus' sayings with—perhaps—some incidents of his career, and a narrative biography written a generation or so after his death by one who never knew him. Our information on these matters comes from a second century writer, a Greek Christian, who tells us that Mark wrote Peter's reminiscences and that Matthew made a collection of Jesus' sayings. Scholars generally agree that these are our Gospel of Mark, and the "Sermon on the Mount" about as we have them in Matthew 6 and following. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke were probably written near the end of the century, the former by a Jewish Christian and the latter by the Greek physician, frequently mentioned in Paul's epistles. Neither had any personal knowledge of Jesus: the first gospel was called *Matthew* because it made such prominent use of Matthew's collection of "the oracles of the Lord," but the actual author is not known. It is evident that he laid great stress on Old Testament prediction, and that he selected his "infancy stories" with reference to them. For him the family home of Jesus was in Bethlehem because it was the home of David. Joseph is warned by a vision, the Wise Men appear from the East, the Bethlehem babies are killed by Herod's order, Jesus escaping by the Flight into Egypt. On their return, the family, fearing Herod's son, settle in Nazareth instead of returning to their home in Bethlehem. It is evident that many and varied infancy stories were circulating, for Luke took an entirely different lot, wholly inconsistent with those in Matthew. In Luke's narrative, the family home was in Nazareth, and the child was born in Bethlehem because of a wholly improbable set of events, including an unknown and unlikely tax order from Rome. The child was publicly presented at the Temple and then taken home to Nazareth. Matthew's stories of the Wise Men, the Slaughter of the Innocents, and the Egyptian journey are replaced by the beautiful tale of the manger and the shepherds. The active career of Jesus, in both Matthew and Luke, is mostly taken from Mark, with some rearrangements and some additions. The experiences of the Resurrection, according to Matthew, are confined to Galilee, whither the disciples had fled after the death of their master. Luke was able to add many parables and sayings of Jesus, not apparently known to the author of Matthew. His resurrection stories are wholly different from and inconsistent with those of Matthew, being located altogether in and about Jerusalem. A few incidents and a few sayings not found in the gospels are quoted by some of the Church fathers or have been found elsewhere. This is about all we have to go on.

The Gospel of John was apparently not known until the latter part of the second century. It could not have been written by the Apostle John. Apparently it was written by a Greek Christian in an effort to fuse certain Greek ideas with those of the developing Christian doctrine. It is a noble book of religious devotion, but there is no reason to suppose that it adds anything to our knowledge of either the events of the life of Jesus or his teaching. What it does give us is a form of Christian theology as it was in the Greek world over a century after the death of Jesus; probably the author intended it to be understood as an allegory, not as a biography. It should not influence us in an attempt to understand the actual career of the great Teacher.

Probably Jesus spoke only Aramaic, though he may have learned a little Hebrew in the synagogue school. A few words and phrases in Aramaic are quoted in the gospels, but we have no reason to suppose that we have his actual words in any important teaching. The gospels were written in Greek, a language of which Jesus, almost certainly, had no knowledge. Many of the most quoted passages differ widely as they are taken from one or another gospel—as, for example, the beatitudes.

Of course the ignorance and superstition of the time took the various materials, distorted them with miracle stories, and with mistaken interpretations; so that it is rather surprising that we get as distinct a figure of the heroic young workman as we do.

One of the commonest ways of evading difficult problems as to our duties in the complexities of our lives is to get sentimental about Jesus. "When in difficulties I turn to Jesus. I ask myself, 'What would Jesus do?'" Our religious services are full of such emotional dodging of responsibility—"Jesus paid it all"—so there is nothing for me to pay, of course. "I do not ask to see the distant scene—one step enough for me." All this seems to me very cheap and very unworthy, and it has thrown the heroic figure of the

young Jewish carpenter into a wholly false and misleading position. Here was a young workman of long ago, early left by the death of his father in the responsible position of breadwinner for the family. He came under the influence of a harsh revivalist of the unsympathetic hermit type, and was baptized by him into the group that believed that "the kingdom of Heaven" was at hand. That meant to the believer of the time that a miracle of divine intervention was about to sweep away the oppressive Roman rule and restore the Jewish kingdom under a new David.

When John was executed Jesus seems to have felt himself called to take his place and carry on the preparation for the great change. He was a very different kind of man, he had lived among the people, knowing their difficulties, their miseries, their kindnesses to one another. He could not flare out at them as a "generation of vipers"; rather were they strayed and misguided children to be loved and led. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus was of the house of David nor that he was born in Bethlehem, certainly none that he was born of a virgin, nor that he was a miracle worker. Probably as his ministry developed he began to think of himself as the expected deliverer. It was widely believed that the Messiah was to be a leader against the Roman Legions, but Jesus could not accept the idea of a war of liberation, and therefore looked for a miraculous deliverance. When the idea of his Messianic character was forced upon him, he acted promptly, setting out for Jerusalem and presenting himself with the authority of his office. When his mistake was finally made evident, we find him despairing and finally dying with the cry that God had forsaken him. The organized church in the Greek world took and distorted the facts of his life, worked out a grotesque and impossible theology, and has consistently ignored the essentials of his teaching. The two most striking elements of the "Sermon on the Mount" are the condemnation of the use of violence, and the warning against riches. The Christian Church has throughout its history used and justified cruelty, violence, and war whenever it was strong enough to make use of them: and it has sought and won wealth, so that today the poor and oppressed are mostly outside of it and look upon it as the ally of the rich and powerful.

Jesus is not an authority on details of conduct. Indeed he is not primarily an "authority" at all; he is an awakener, a stimulator—one who scorns shams and pretenses, one who exalts directness and sincerity. He was like Abraham Lincoln in his capacity to make his meanings vivid by a "little story." But they are powerful only because we see their truth and value. There is nothing in them to be blindly "obeyed." Shall I "hate my father and mother"? Shall I give my spoons to the burglar who has stolen my forks? Shall I invite the man who has blackened my eye to please knock me down? Shall we get what we want by prayer if we are sufficiently importunate as to be a nuisance? Shall we pay workmen without any reference to the amount of work they have done? Shall we receive the prodigal, repentant because he is hungry and miserable? Shall we drop all our concerns to look after the needs of any stranger injured by the roadside? Is the general run of us middle-class, comfortable people a mass of hypocrisy? What is the point of cursing a fig tree for not having figs, when it is not fig season? Should all well-to-do people sell all they have and give to the poor? Is a man likely to be good if he is a beggar and bad if he is rich? Was it not a bit hard on the innocent owner of the herd of pigs when the devils were sent into them so that they rushed into the sea and were drowned? Are there devils and can they be sent into pigs?

But supposing we can answer these questions, do they answer our questions? Is there any illumination of the parent-child problem either in the command to "honor" or in the command to "hate" father and mother? The last does remind us that there is a problem of alternative loyalties. "Let him have your cloak also" suggests that there is—or may be—something more to it than mere theft when a man steals your coat; and "turn the other also" might make one consider why he was first smitten. So also with the employment problem, the wealth problem, the property problem—the problem of evil in general. I am not suggesting that Jesus had any of these things very definitely in mind, but he had insight into the complexity of human problems and a profound sympathy with the oppressed. He saw things from an unusual angle, and tended to break up the complacency of the multitudes who live by phrases and formulas, the "Pharisees"—the respectable, comfortable folk who make the formulas and make them to suit themselves.

I wonder what would happen if a few thousand "Christians" faced these facts: a third of our population living below a low decency level in a time of greatest wealth production; seven to ten millions unemployed with billions of capital also unemployed and the things they could produce needed but not supplied; the rich evading their taxes, throwing the burden of taxation upon the poor; convicted criminals and many unconvicted of the same class in public offices or dictating who shall fill them; preparations for war everywhere and not a clear word as to what the war is to accomplish; high pressure peace campaigns with equal lack of clarity. Well, let us get a group to STUDY—what?

As to Man

ROBERT SCOTT KELLERMAN

Driving the automobile across the country from Blanchester to Palestine in the state of Ohio, in the month of October, was a continuous source of surprise and delight. The early tints of autumn, the bright colors of the trees and fields, the young grain sprouting through the ground, the shocks of corn, the farms, buildings, premises, and the family dwellings furnished enjoyment and refreshment, and a kind of worldly worship on that gorgeous Sunday morning. But, aside from the scenes of outward beauty, my mind was engrossed by men, women, and children and the estate of their lives, who lived, labored, and loved by the side of the roads over which we traveled. All the land would have been forests and jungles, without roads or dwellings, but for them. We were en route to Palestine, where I was to preach the "occasional sermon" to an assembly gathering in the church. I was to preach on the subject "Man: What I Believe About Man."

And, although I had carefully prepared the sermon, additional touches were to be added, gathered from the scenes and the thoughts of the journey. By the side of the road everywhere, uphill and down, by the river and on the uplands, I was concerned with man—men, women, and children—old, young, and middle-aged. I began and ended with man.

Man is the mightiest animal of the physical world. Primarily he is an animal. He is akin to all material life. He is brother to the mountains, the rivers, the fields, the birds, the tigers, the fishes, the reptiles, and everything that has form and feature. Man is animal. Man is material. But he is not only material and animal. Added to his animal life, there is an inscrutable compulsion that carries him into a realm which is not material, not animal. There is a persistence, and an intelligence which we call spirit. We call it spirit, by which we mean breath, courage, vigor, intelligence and will, which are its chief attributes and characteristics. What spirit is, nobody knows. But we know something of a quality, a talent, a power, call it what you will, which is not shared by physical things nor material animals but is possessed and used by man himself, alone. Physically, man is similar to other animals. His primary concerns are food, protection, and the rearing of his kind. He is an aggressor in procuring food and drink, and a warrior in self-defense. But his dwellings and premises, his fields, roads, villages, cities, monuments are not due primarily to his physical abilities but to his physical abilities only as they are energized, directed, and controlled by spiritual thought, mind, will. All the improvements of the earth for the whim or the benefit of humans, all the physical structures, such as homes, roads, fields, dams, gardens, everything, all belong, in their inception, construction, and purpose not to man's physical nature but to the mind; not to the hand but to the head; not to matter but to spirit; and not to the animal, but to man. All education, betterment, culture, religion have their origin and compulsion not in the animal realm, but in the spiritual.

If one asked me to put my finger on some of the outstanding results of man's spiritual activities, I should point out man's language, both spoken and written, by which he communicates his thoughts to others, not thoughts personal to himself, but thoughts of distant things and things dissociated from his necessities. The animals may have a limited language, limited to their lives and environs, but nothing farther. Man expands and enlarges, writes in characters that are transmitted to posterity thousands of years afterwards. Man creates and invents tools, implements, vehicles, by which he builds monuments, dwellings, cathedrals; implements by which he cultivates the soil, commits his surpluses to commerce, and himself travels from country to country; also creates vehicles and devices by which he tames the wild powers of nature and lays on them his burden of carrying intelligence, information, events, and daily news; creates literature, music, oratory, and drama, for the edification and the joy of the world. All of these are absent from the life and habits of the animals. They have no spiritual existence comparable to man. Man is largely spiritual. He is distinguished from the mere animal life, as life is distinguished from the dull earth.

The mind is a restless adventuring attribute of man which is not content to behold the present makeup of nature 'round about him, but must look behind the scenes and inquire particularly as to his own origin. Whence did he come? How did he receive or acquire his quality, his mind, his spirit? What, or Who created him, and conferred upon him intellectual qualities and his spiritual capacities? Is the simple answer the name of God? There are other names that may or may not signify the same thing, or power, or being, such as Allah, Buddha, Brahma, Zeus, Jupiter, or "some power back of nature." But with all answers put together, answers both of religionists, scientists, students, professors, and laymen, there is actually no knowledge about it.

There is a large and growing company of reverent students and scholars who trace the method and the progress of the coming of man to his present physical form, along with which it appears his spiritual qualities and faculties have also gradually come. But the primary origin of matter and of mind, the creator of them, has not been discovered by their researches. There are evidences that indicate, and I suppose prove, that evolution, development, progress have been proceeding for millions of years both in the making of animals and in the making of man. These evidences are open to anyone who wishes to study them. There are books in every great library on geology, chemistry, archaeology, anthropology, and on other sciences that relate the story of progress; there are museums in every great city in the civilized world where skeletons, bones, tools, instruments, and other exhibits speak in their dumb language their part in the story of creation. But all these together do not tell the primary origin of the world and of man, nor yet the power that propelled evolution from lower to higher forms of life, nor of physical life into spiritual life.

It is unnecessary to argue at this late date that the fact of evolution is not immoral, irreligious, nor atheistic. What does it matter to the spirit of faith and worship whether God created man in an instant, by the fiat of his power, or by the long and intricate processes of nature, through the ages of unnumbered centuries? The power of God is not disputed. If the doctrine of evolution is different from the doctrine of the Christian Scriptures, is it not possible that we may have misinterpreted the contents of some parts of the Bible? The Bible is literature of the highest religious aptitude of man—soul-searching experiences in his researches after the eternal and the everlasting truth of his own creation, his soul, and God.

If the mind is not content with the little that it knows about its immediate present, cannot unfold the mystery of the past, neither can it rest contented about the future, but it must also wonder and speculate about its future. Man lingers over death and inquires what follows? The body dies, perishes, dissolves. What becomes of the mind? Is there any indication, any evidence? What could constitute evidence? There has been a widely-extended, ages-long belief in immortality. There are students of anthropology who claim that there is evidence of the faith of immortality held by the Cro-Magnon race of man twenty-five thousand years ago. All the great religions now existing believe it and teach it. Should one call universal belief evidence and proof? Or is it only faith? And is faith proof? Whatever the weight of argument and of faith, there are some pertinent facts that serve to incline practically all mankind, in all the religions, and throughout all the ages, to the belief in immortality. The facts are these:

1. Death finds the mind incompleted. The body may be worn out, but not the mind. The fruits upon the trees ripen, and they perish. Their life is completed. They have accomplished a purpose. They perish.

That might be said also of man's body. But that cannot be said of the mind or spirit. Its capability is still unimpaired.

2. The mind always retains its love of life, its desire and its persistence to live. The physical body possesses no consciousness of existence, no impulsion to live. It is the mind that defies death and insists upon life.

3. The increasing capacity for inventive and creative adventure, enjoyment, personal usefulness, and worth is an inherent quality of the mind. The extreme limit of human life does not afford time nor circumstance to complete man's capacity nor his desire for the continued exercise of his abilities and talents.

These facts may not be classed as evidence. But what is evidence in the realm of spirit? These facts have a plausibility that tend to satisfy the hunger and thirst for immortality. But in any event here is man, richly endowed, with great opportunities spread out before him, with a possible life-span of nearly a hundred years, and a human destiny becoming him to carve out a life worthy of his spiritual endowments and prophetic of life eternal and everlasting. Let us make good our possibilities and trust in the Eternal Mind.

"Tis midnight. From the dark blue sky
The stars which now look down on earth,
Have seen ten thousand centuries fly,
And give to countless changes birth.

And when the pyramids shall fall,
And, mouldering, mix as dust in air,
The dwellers on this altered ball
May still behold them glorious there.

Shine on O stars! With you I tread
The march of ages, orbs of light!
At last eclipse o'er you may spread!
But me, to me, there comes no night!"

Religion, Race, and Cultural Pluralism

VICTOR S. YARROS

The concept of cultural pluralism is not new, yet many educated, tolerant, and apparently progressive people fail to grasp it, or to accept, if they render it lip-service, all the important conclusions which it imposes upon us. Persons who disclaim all religious, racial, or social prejudices, and who appear to realize the emptiness and worthlessness of the kind of "unity" which is produced by repression, suppression, bigotry, and terror, surprise one occasionally by expressing sentiments which point to a longing for artificial and deceptive unity and are incompatible with cultural pluralism.

In recent years, as everybody knows, there has been a recrudescence of the pseudo-scientific worship of "racialism." The notion that some "races" are superior to all others dies hard. One "chosen people," or race, takes the place of another. The judgment of science, of experience, of common sense, is disregarded, and the self-styled superior race, or people, commits atrocities which amaze and sicken all civilized persons, thus demonstrating not its own superiority, but the weakness and insecurity of the whole fabric of human culture.

The melancholy truth is that the rebarbarization of any society or nation is far from being a remote possibility. Given certain conjunctures and combinations, any nation may lose its veneer of civilization and revert to savagery. There are such phenomena as mass aberrations, mass crazes, mass hysteria. Perhaps these lapses cannot be prevented by any known means, but the duty of civilized men and women is to try to prevent them by self-restraint, by example, by education, and by attention to early symptoms of retrogression.

Education is particularly necessary in connection with the question of cultural pluralism: of variety and diversity within the given society, of respect for differences and dissimilarities, or mutual understanding and sympathy between majorities and minorities, and minorities and minorities.

Take first the fallacies of racialism. In a recent book, entitled *We Europeans,* Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon have analyzed the concept of race and attempted to show that there is no such thing as a pure race. No human group, they affirm, is biologically distinct from any other group. Interbreeding and intercourse of all sorts have destroyed primitive isolation. What we have today, and have had for centuries, are *ethnic groups,* not races. Talk of race prejudice is, therefore, loose and meaningless. Prejudices are religious, social, economic, and cultural, and are attributable mainly to ignorance, provincialism, envy, jealousy, fear, and vicious propaganda.

As Lessing taught many decades ago, it is only in terms of individuals that we can predicate superiority or inferiority. No ethnic group has a monopoly of talent or of virtue. Science, philosophy, religion, and art are synthetic products; *all* groups have made their contributions, and are making them now, to the stock of human values. In the words of Sidney Webb, there is "reciprocity in specific excellences." One group stands highest in the realm of music, another in poetry, a third in metaphysics, a fourth in the application of science and technology. To look down upon any group is to expose one's own stupidity or littleness.

Take next the concept of nationality. There are distinct nations, or countries, and each has a flag and some special form of government. Loyalty is demanded to the flag and to the government, and to this demand, rightly interpreted, there can be no objection. But we hear a good deal also about the need of national unity, and to this demand the cultural pluralists have very serious objections.

What is meant by unity? How much unity is essential to the safety and stability of a nation or state? Switzerland is the classical example of a state that has sufficient unity to preserve its independence and its character as a nation. But is there complete unity in Switzerland? Not religious unity, not "racial" unity, and not linguistic unity. French, German and Italian sections, plus religious differences, are not incompatible with unity in some sense, though that sense has never been clearly and accurately explained.

A citizen who obeys the reasonable and enforcible laws of his country, who pays taxes, who fights for his country in a defensive war, who observes the general moral standards of the country is a good citizen thereof. In many respects he or she may fail to please the

majority, may be "peculiar," but that will not affect his or her status as a good citizen.

To Americans, or modern Europeans, such affirmations as these should be axiomatic, but unfortunately they are not. Positions are often taken, in controversies over religion, race, or general philosophical attitude, which betray a longing for, or sympathy with, the reactionary idea of a totalitarian and authoritarian state, or culture, and which demand a kind of unity that involves the denial of spiritual and intellectual and artistic liberty, and condemns all originality and uniqueness.

The most striking example of such unconscious espousal of the principle of the totalitarian and authoritarian state, or culture, may be found in a recent discussion in *The Christian Century,* and in other journals of religion or ethics, of the eternal "Jewish Problems." Distinguished educators, ministers, and authors took part in that debate, which, inevitably perhaps, generated considerable heat.

The debate was provoked by the publication of some books and sermons in which certain eminent rabbis—notably Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan—expounded the thesis that Judaism should be regarded as a *civilization* rather than as a religion, and that the proper mission and duty of American Jews is to cultivate and exalt that distinctive civilization. The cultivation of this civilization is to result in permanent "cultural differentiation," but *not* to prevent social, economic, and political coöperation and assimilation. The Jews, as a minority group, are to be keenly conscious at all times of their *peculiarities,* and to resign themselves to the idea of permanent cultural separation from the majority, which, we are told, will never really understand the essence of the Jewish civilization.

Now, this thesis has been sharply criticized on the ground that, if lived up to, it is bound to create friction and trouble, to stimulate and justify anti-Semitism. The disappearance of anti-Semitism, it has been asserted, presupposes increasing assimilation and interpenetration, tolerance based on comprehension and sympathy, hope of ultimate reconciliation, and the emergence of a religious synthesis. To preach persistent cultivation of peculiarities, therefore, is to invite conflict and misunderstanding.

To the advocates of cultural pluralism, however, this objection, as stated, savors of bigotry and provincialism. Why should anyone resent peculiarities that do not impede or discourage economic and political assimilation, practical coöperation in a hundred fields, sincere love of country and humanity, and acceptance of all the rational corollaries of common citizenship?

The angry rejection of the thesis of Rabbi Kaplan and his school is strange and surprising indeed when liberals and progressives in religion and ethics proclaim it. Accept cultural pluralism, and the thesis is natural and harmless. The question of an ultimate religious synthesis, though important, may be left to the future. It must come as a product of slow evolution; it cannot be imposed by force and arbitrary decrees. And it ought not to be so enforced. In the house of human civilization, at the present stage, there are many mansions, and each of them has its place and its worth.

The question raised by the thesis under discussion is one of fact, not of principle—a point overlooked, curiously enough, by nearly all the debaters. If the Jews possess certain desirable and laudable cultural peculiarities that are worth preserving, there is no good reason why they should not be preserved. But do they? And, if they do, what are these peculiarities?

What broad-minded persons interested in the controversy should require from Dr. Kaplan and his school is a "bill of particulars." It is incumbent upon them, philosophically speaking, to inform us just what the unique Jewish civilization that they cherish is in essence and spirit. Wherein does it differ from Christian civilization, from the civilization conceived and pictured by modern western science and philosophy but in part adumbrated by Plato and Aristotle, or even by Buddha and Confucius?

It is hardly to be supposed that any enlightened person, in speaking of the value of any civilization, will allude to mere ritual, ceremonial, and particular forms of organization. No civilization worthy of name can be identified with the rite of circumcision, or the observance of this or that day of rest, or a certain restricted diet. Civilization has to do with the things of the spirit, with conduct—"three-fourths of life"—which affects one's neighbors, fellow citizens, and fellow humans. It is surely not unreasonable to ask for light on Jewish peculiarities, or Christian peculiarities, for that matter, the loss of which would mean the loss of a great and historic civilization?

Pending compliance with this request, let us turn to history, to sacred literature, in short, to the highest sources available, for possible illumination.

There are, of course, the Ten Commandments, and there are the Hebrew prophets, major and minor. There is the golden rule.

Which of these assets of civilization is either exclusively Jewish or exclusively Christian?

In a recent book, *The Great Galilean Returns,* the author, Henry Kendall Booth, writes as follows of the Hebrew Prophets:

> "The prophets were religious reformers; breaking with the priests who defined religion in terms of ritual, and demanding its practical expression in social action. To them ethical conduct was the sole test of religion; and Micah speaks for them all: 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?'"

Miss Edith Hamilton, in her book on *The Prophets of Israel,* sums up the teachings of those great souls as follows:

> "In their eyes, men of religion were committed to a definite enterprise, to end all injustice, the core of which to them was economic injustice.
>
> "The prophets' sense of values was sure. They knew unerringly what was important and what was not. Religion's work was to create a world where no one was oppressed.
>
> "The prophets saw a world where no man was wronged by another, where the strong shared with the weak, where no individual was sacrificed for an end, where each individual was prepared to sacrifice himself for the end of making what God wished become a realized good."

The prophets, concludes Miss Hamilton, are spokesmen for humanity, and we realize through them the underlying unity of human beings and the permanence of every great vision for good. And what did the prophets say in the name of the Lord? They spoke of peace, righteousness, justice, and fraternity.

Jesus and his first disciples continued the work of the prophets. They added, indeed, but little to the message of the prophets, though they shifted the emphasis somewhat. The master idea, the master word, of the Old Testament is Righteousness. The master idea of Jesus is Love, and by love he meant good will. His kingdom of God was to be realized on earth; his

gospel was thoroughly social. He was not interested in personal holiness. He demanded equality, service, charity, forgiveness, unselfishness. He denounced greed, arrogance, pride, cruelty, and vindictiveness. He hated hypocrisy and smugness. And James, his brother, almost in the terms of Micah, condensed the gospel into Micah's formula.

If today the Jews are guided by Micah and the other prophets, and the Christians by Jesus and James, then there is only *one* world-civilization, and it is at once Jewish and Christian. And, it may be added, it is also the civilization of the Agnostics and the philosophical Hedonists. To talk of Jewish peculiarities incomprehensible to Gentiles, or of Christian mysteries utterly beyond the grasp of Jews, is to indulge in glittering and meaningless phrases.

All intelligent men and women understand what is meant by the terms justice, righteousness, charity, mercy, kindliness, sympathy, and humility. We may not all see eye to eye when attempting to translate those terms into proposals or plans for a social order. Not all sincere followers of the Hebrew prophets, or of Jesus, accept Collectivism, for example, and reject the profit system, competition, and private enterprise. But differences of opinion upon specific economic and political measures are relatively unimportant. The spirit, the attitude, the vision alone matter. A philosophy and disposition based on the prophets and the New Testament make for union, not division. The kingdom, or order, envisaged and forecast by the prophets and by Jesus is above race, above nationality, above denomination, above class. The bigots, fanatics, and upholders of the totalitarian and authoritarian state or society are neither good Christians, nor good Jews, nor good human beings, from the viewpoint of their own professed ideals and principles.

Mathematics for the Million

MAY STRANATHAN

Salvation by numbers is proposed by Launcelot Hogben, an English professor, in his voluminous volume, *Mathematics for the Million.* If the author does not boldly declare we can be saved by numbers, he does say we cannot be saved without them. He is not speaking of the salvation of our souls in the next world, but of salvation from economic slavery in this world. This salvation cannot be brought to us by experts of this day, for their charts are made without comprehensive study of the subjects they profess to illuminate. Mr. Hogben does not put his faith in any system now presented for the regulation of our troubles of production and distribution, but in the future understanding of mathematics by the man in the street, the workshop, the counting house, and on the farm.

This would seem a hopeless ambition at first glance, but Mr. Hogben says not so, that the average intellect can comprehend the science of numbers, which enters into every aspect of life—taxes, wages, interest, insurance, discount, the relation of the birth rate to production and consumption. In fact everything in the material world! The author compares the whoopers-up of systems for economic security today to the priests among the ancients, who understood just enough mathematics to enable them to make others believe in their pretentions to divine revelations. If Mr. Hogben is right in this, probably the phrase, "Figures cannot lie, but liars can figure," originated with some poor commoner in Egypt or Babylonia who was somewhat more clever at figures and in reading human nature than his fellows.

To one poor at figures, salvation by arithmetic seems a hopeless chasing of prosperity around hundreds of corners of Robin Hood's barn, but the book is so fascinating that even the most ignorant in the domain of numbers is inspired with hope that even he will some time be able to work out the many problems attached to the end of each chapter of the book. Much of this fascination lies in the history of numbers from the first observations of the shepherds who counted their flocks on the eastern plains and learned to measure the length of the year, of the days and nights, and divide them into hours, by the shadows cast by the staff in a land of sunshine by day, and bright stars and a luminous moon by night. Geometry is the first language of numbers, the hieroglyphics of mathematics, according to the author, and later geometry was made an intellectual exercise by the Greek philosophers. Thus for many centuries mankind was debarred from the practical use of numbers through the knowledge of algebra and trigonometry. Some fun is poked at Plato and Aristotle for ascribing a divine origin and a mystical meaning to numbers. Perhaps the author is justified in this, for even Emerson, who told a critic of Plato that when he struck at the king he should kill him, says that the king of philosophers throws a little mathematical dust in our eyes in the eighth book of *The Republic.* This same tendency to ascribe a sort of divinity to numbers by philosophers of today, Jeans, Eddington, and Einstein, has been ridiculed in a screamingly funny book, *Numerology,* by E. T. Bell, professor of mathematics in the California Institute of Technology. Mr. Hogben tells us that many of the ancients even ascribed sex to numbers, the odd ones being male and the even numbers female.

Despite this denial of an eternal absolute to numbers, their mystery still remains for most of us as great a mystery as the creation of life itself. We still feel like asking, "Where did you come from, Number dear?" and expecting all the little numbers from one to nine inclusive to answer in chorus, "Out of the everywhere into the here." We cannot escape, because of the jibes of mathematicians, from the thought attributed to Pythagoras that "God geometrizes." There comes to mind a passage about a snowstorm in Harper's prize novel for 1937, *The Seven Who Fled,* by Frederic Prokosch: "He could detect in the snow the most dazzling ornaments and devices, a million intricate shapes, a pure and crystal world unbelievably ornate and perfect. . . . a million crystals of infinite complexity." Nor can we forget Agnes Lee's poem, "Numbers," in which she says:

> With lamps upheld, austere and strong,
> They wait behind the muses;
> Unseeing we pass their pattern in the grass,
> But we are theirs and they defy eternity.

How does it come that this most exacting of sciences, the foundation of all sciences, so stimulates the imagination and leads us onward into wonderland? Numbers mount and mount, like the public debt, till we become as the defrauding speculator whose lawyer said in his defense that he had a disease of the mind which made him think only in millions—or billions. How is it that this supposedly most unemotional of studies soars away from us into the blue mists beyond which we have been wont to think of as heaven—the heaven into which we now hope Mr. Hogben and his assistants in writing *Mathematics for the Million,* will be able to lead us, something better even than adequate wages, plenty of food, and good houses?

Was not the author of the adventures of *Alice in Wonderland,* a teacher of mathematics? Perhaps, instead of the book being his diversion from the uninteresting exactions of numbers, it was the result of an imagination unduly enlivened by them.

Mathematics for the Million is said to be a best seller in England, and what American is willing to admit that he cannot master any book that an Englishman can? Even such of us as regret the passing of the abacus—that simple counting device now relegated to the nursery—when he tackles the problems by means of which the author tests the mentality of his readers, must feel as did the man who, hearing the remark that woman is the conumdrum of the century, replied that though he could not guess her, he would never give her up. If Mr. Hogben thinks we can do these sums, we will attempt them every one, hoping to persevere to the end, bitter though it may be. Yet as we grope through a maze of arcs, tangents, sines, cosines, cube roots, graphs, equations, semantics, differential calculus, and logarithms (the last said to be designed to make calculations simpler instead of more complicated, as we had always thought), we turn with sad longing to the lines of the poet who said:

> The shadow of the shepherd's staff first gave
> To man the sense of shuttling time and space;
> Since then availeth neither toil not heavenly grace
> To free men from these jugglers, till the grave
> Hides him from their imprisoning architrave.
> As Crusoe, startled by a footstep's trace,
> Wondered, the shepherd first began to place
> His universe as measured by his stave.
>
> Go, shepherd, go thy way and feed thy sheep,
> Look not beyond them any more, nor bind
> More puzzling tyrannies upon mankind.
> The light for feeding sheep, the dark for sleep,
> Is all you need to know nor need you heed
> How high the shadow reaches, nor how deep.

Study Table

The Divine Tragedy of the Prophet Jeremiah

HEARKEN UNTO THE VOICE. *By Franz Werfel. New York: The Viking Press.* $3.00.

The Bible down through the ages has inspired the world's greatest literature. From Milton to Thomas Mann and Franz Werfel is only an indication of the tremendous tragedy in the two Testaments. This time it is Jeremiah, the most tragic of all the Old Testament Prophets, who is put into a full length novel of 750 pages. The author will be remembered as the one who wrote the much discussed *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh.* There is just as much power and skill in the *Jeremiah* as in the *Musa Dagh.*

The literary device Werfel used in this interpretation of Jeremiah is the familiar one of making an historical character relive his total experience. The setting is the present city of Jerusalem. Clayton Reeves, fearing an attack of epilepsy, catches sight of his watch at twenty-three minutes to six. He loses consciousness on the spot where stood the Temple. At this point *incipit vita Hieremiae prophetae.* Werfel, who is a Jew, sees in Jeremiah's life the tragedy which he himself and this troubled world are undergoing. It is as baffling to him as it was to the great prophet. Werfel himself says:

> Ever since my youth the hero of this book has occupied my thoughts, but it seems as if this day, with all its storming and suffering, had to come before I found courage to look him truly in the eye. Now, I believe that I have delivered my soul of all that burned for utterance and was given me to say.

Jeremiah emerges in these pages as a living, breathing, tempted, baffled man-of-God. His fight against institutionalism and the attempt of institutionalism to crush him find full expression. Also Jeremiah's constant quarrel with God comes to the fore—the many things the prophet cannot understand, try as he will. At last the religion of the spirit conquers the religion of the Temple, but the way is the road of suffering and often despair. Surely Jeremiah's life is a divine tragedy. The psychology of prophecy is not neglected: God literally talks to Jeremiah and the prophet must hearken unto the voice.

But the novelized biography is more than this. A whole generation is recreated amidst one of the most important periods in world history. The civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia, and Palestine are introduced as Jeremiah makes his way through each. Stretching the Biblical narrative, Werfel has Jeremiah accompany the family of King Josiah to Memphis where he falls in love with an Egyptian woman who dies before the marriage. After her death Jeremiah explores, with the help of the *Book of the Dead,* the Egyptian land of the dead. Later in Babylon he has a similar experience. Both explanations convince him that the only God is the God of the Unutterable Name, Jahveh. The archaeological passages are superb. It is encouraging to see the results of this new science creeping into the greatest novels of today.

The book closes on the tragic note. Jeremiah doomed to die in Egypt against his will cries out:

> Yet there is one thing, Lord, which I do not understand concerning the love which is in Thee. Thou hast commanded us in Thy Law to deal justly with our bondservants, but with me hast Thou dealt as harshly as the law-breakers in Israel have dealt with their slaves. Forgive me, Lord, if I speak foolishly in my heart, for the words do not pass beyond my lips. I do not complain because Thou didst send me forth and did not spare me, saying: "Go hither and go thither! Speak this and speak that!" I went forth and I spoke, and they put me in the stocks and the dungeons and the stinking pit. A thousand times more would I have been willing to do and endure it only it had borne but a little fruit.

Perhaps better than any other has Jeremiah represented the untutored spirit of man wandering in this trackless universe.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Jews and Christians

AN OPEN LETTER TO JEWS AND CHRISTIANS. *By John Cournos.* 183 *pp. New York: The Oxford University Press.* $2.00.

COMMON GROUND. *By Morris S. Lazaron.* 328 *pp. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.* $2.50.

John Cournos believes that the Jews should reclaim Jesus and accept him as their own. He first put forth this idea in a much-discussed article in the *Atlantic Monthly,* entitled "An Epistle to the Jews." This article has now been expanded and enriched into this book, and, in spite of the new title, still remains a plea addressed primarily to Jews. He wants Jews and Christians to get together—he thinks they *must* get together, if they are to survive the terrors of this modern world—and he declares that Jesus is "the only factor which may be used as a rallying cry against the gathering forces of Anti-Christ."

What stirs Mr. Cournos is the plight of Christians and Jews these days. The Jews have long been the victims of oppression. Now the Christians, persecutors of the Jews for centuries, have suddenly themselves become the persecuted. In country after country in Europe, they are being thrust back into that position of a minority group from which they escaped in the reign of Constantine. Jews and Christians, in other words, are now face to face with Communism and Fascism, which would doom them alike to extinction. These common enemies, says Mr. Cournos, "should make of Jew and Christian common friends." These latter must join hands in a mutual struggle for survival. They can win this struggle only by making it a common cause. And the one point of union is Jesus—the Jew whose teachings were rooted in Israel and flowered in Christianity. Why should they not in him be one?

This idea that the Jews should reclaim Jesus as their own is nothing new. I remember preaching many years ago a sermon on "If I Were a Jew," in which I said that, if I were a Jew, I would recognize Jesus as among the prophets of my people, and try to recover him from the control of Christians. Jesus, after all, was a son of the synagogue, he knew nothing of the church. Christianity as such began with Paul, while Jesus died, as he had lived, a Jew. But Mr. Cournos adds something like a new touch to this idea by suggesting that Jews should reclaim Jesus by coming over to him in his place in Christendom, rather than by seizing him and bringing him back to his old place in Israel. Mr. Cournos does not expect the Jews to be converted, nor to surrender their culture and tradition. "As long as Christianity is not truly Christian," he writes, "the Jews are bound, in principle, to remain Jews." But he goes right on to speak of the Jews as "choosing in the name of Christ to throw in their lot" with Christians, and, as though in anticipation of trouble, says "Why all this pother? Why should not the Jew become outright a Christian?" This, of course, is fantastic. If the Jews are ever to accept Jessus, it must be on their own terms. All of which means that, while Mr. Cournos' spirit is admirable and his plea sound, as his vision of the world is certainly clear, his emphasis is wrong in its suggestion of surrender by the Jews rather than of reconciliation by the Christian! What must be sought here is mutual good will. Whatever is done must take the form of "common measures" as dictated by "a common cause."

Rabbi Lazaron is also seeking common ground as between Jews and Christians. He makes no mention of Mr. Cournos' proposal. While deploring Jewish separation along any nationalistic or even cultural lines, he feels that Jews must still cling to their distinctive "idea of a religious community" as the very basis of their integrity. But the spirit and achievement of Americanism as a reconciliation of many peoples out of alienation, even hostility, into friendly accord and cooperation—this fascinates him, and in his book he explores the ground of reconciliation of Jews and Christians, as of diverse other groups, in this hospitable republic. His discussion is practical rather than theoretical; it deals with ways and means more than with ideas. It covers a wide field—anti-Semitism here and abroad, Palestine as a great philanthropic and cultural adventure but not as a nationalistic state, the work of the National Conference of Jews and Christians. Rabbi Lazaron is objective in his viewpoint, dispassionate in his spirit. He is unwilling to yield to hate or bitterness, and seeks resolutely for understanding and good will. His book is a useful primer of the new age which yet must come if humanity is to survive.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 50)

teach the Europeans the immorality of assuming private property and land, and the folly of poverty amidst plenty. They would expose the economic witch doctors who order wheat to be burned and oranges to be thrown into the sea, in order to placate their mysterious gods. Hindus and Eskimos, Negritos and natives of the Luchu Islands (whom Napolean called "savages" because they had no weapons) would teach us pacifism. The word "democracy" would at last acquire some meaning in the West with the representation of the ancient village republics of India, re-born and federated into the first democratic state the world has ever seen.

Even our religion and our personal habits would be improved by such a League. Armed force would clearly be eliminated. Indeed, the only opposition that could possibly come to such a project would be from a minority of European savages and their unfortunate Japanese imitators; and these will obviously have to be educated and civilized a little before such a League is possible. The desire to arm the present League has arisen primarily from the fact that it was founded to guarantee Britain and France the possession of their colonial loot.

Enormous powers of conciliation would be exercised by such a League, though it is doubtful whether they would be required in a world which could produce such a League as this. There would, of course, be no place in such a world for mandates or for non-self-governing areas. Dictatorships—and every colonial government is by definition a dictatorship—could not exist.

Mr. Disraeli once said of Mr. Gladstone that he did not mind his having a fifth ace up his sleeve, but he did object to the suggestion that the Almighty had put it there. The British, more than all the imperialist powers, shut their eyes to the fact that colonies are acquired and held by force and fraud, and they obstinately stand by the legend that God flipped them into their pockets. Like the fox in the fable, who found himself in the hen-coop, they always feel it their duty to remain until peace and order are restored.

Here we are meeting our old friend "the lesser evil" again—the doctrine which, among others, declares that though war is a crime we must participate in this war because the alternative is something worse. So in this business of mandates and colonies the argument runs that though the system is a denial of democracy, self-gov-

(*Continued on page* 64)

Correspondence

A Voice from Australia

[Following are a few sentences from a personal letter just received from Dr. Charles Strong, for sixty years pastor of the "Australian Church" in Melbourne, and Australian correspondent of UNITY.—SYDNEY STRONG.]

"Militarism is indeed the great foe of Democracy and of Christianity, appealing as it does to brute force and fear.

"Once let autocrats into the saddle of government, with an army of slaves at their command, and then farewell to liberty and humanity for a time at least, until what George Fox called 'the seed' manages to recreate itself.

"One ray of hope is that we are as never before realizing what militarism means, and that the human world is waking up to the danger and deviltry of it.

"The world, I hope, is 'grey with morning light,' but the peacemakers have a big struggle before them. Who was it that said, 'We have forgotten God'? Our Christianity and our churches have to be born anew, if the Kingdom is to come. Our Christianity has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

"And now what is to be done? Don't we want a new civilization founded on a Christian religion?"

Always Counts on UNITY

Editor of UNITY:

Enclosed is p. o. order for three dollars, for which please renew my subscription.

Some comments concerning Russia during the past year have distressed me, and the letter from David Jobman (issue of March 21) in the Correspondence Department (which is always interesting) is comforting. The Thomas Paine issue was splendid, as were the Sacco-Vanzetti and other anniversary numbers. And I always count on my UNITY for news from Ghandi and India.

MRS. E. W. HARDY,

Santa Ana, California.

Our Deepest Thanks!

Editor of UNITY:

I think of you often with sympathy. . . No matter where we turn, we find chaos and mass murder, as though Jesus had never been born and no one had ever talked of brotherhood.

I want you to know how I rejoice in every knock-out blow you strike in UNITY against the things that UNITY has always been against.

O. C. S.

SUNDAYS

White-robed and tall they come, unstooped with care,
Untouched, untainted by the drab and dour,
With hushed expectancy from waking hour,
With mystic peace, with chanting in the air;

Named for the Lord hence they shall ever wear
A halo, folded hands and festal flower,
Shall march serene, shall mount the lofty tower
Of contemplation—which the world may share.

They speak of God, His labor done, at rest;
Of Christ, uprisen and victorious;
Of Mary, with the pure and virgin heart,
Obedient to the Highest, henceforth blest;
Of saintly lives, aflame and glorious
Like tapers lit by God and set apart.

ANNERIKA FRIES.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 63)

ernment, peace, and everything in which we believe, we must sacrifice these principles to some vague expediency. One recalls that great "humanitarian" Sir John Hawkins, father of the African slave trade, who shipped his prisoners of war as slaves to America and considered himself a great public benefactor. "For," he said, "had I not bought these captives from their captors, they would have been eaten; whereas now they are only slaves."

A world of peace will mean that white people living in colonial possessions will have to abandon all their privileges; and, unless they can live by their own labor without a host of native servants, they may as well leave the country. Their chance to remain and live useful lives will depend on their ability to do what William Penn did among the American Indians, reputed at the time to be the fiercest savages in the world.

Our final problem will be to bring a liberated world into free economic coöperation, and to organize the supply and distribution of commodities according to world needs. This means nothing less than world socialism. For, as every child knows, the capitalist system does not supply anything according to anybody's needs, but according to estimated profits. The old fallacy that imperialism "develops the resources" of backward countries was exposed forever when capitalism began to restrict production by legislation, as it did in the Dutch East Indies and elsewhere. All solutions that are not to lead us back into the morass must begin with the repudiation of power politics and the economics of rent and usury from which power politics arise.

To talk about this sort of League is, of course, utopian. To start thus with the world as we would have it, is admittedly idealistic. But the fundamental assumption of those who believe in world peace is that the ideal is realizable. On the other hand, the so-called realists who assume that imperialist governments can change their nature are as near the fulfillment of their dreams as the man who hopes for a capitalist system in which the owners decline to make any profit.

Utopian, yes. Idealistic, yes. But what is the alternative if not continued compromises that involve a betrayal of our basic principles?

Western Poets Congress

Declaring "every weapon is a boomerang," the third annual Western Poets Congress, held March 31, with more than 300 poets attending from 27 cities in five states, declared its opposition to the May Bill as opposed to all for which poetry stands; its allegiance to the Lord's Hour movement for more religious and socially significant poetry; and its faith that "every soul is a needed word in the poem that is the universe which the Great Poet is writing." Presided over by Ralph Cheyney, it passed resolutions submitted by Lucia Trent and others opposing militarism, Naziism, Fascism and all foes of democracy. It branded "underpay and underplay" as two of poetry's worst enemies.

Significant was a resolution unanimously passed demanding complete equality of political, economic, social, educational, and cultural opportunity for all, "especially for two of the most poetic of groups: the Negroes and Jews." To these groups the Congress passed a vote of eternal gratitude and admiration for their contributions to poetry and life.

—*Ralph Cheyney, President, Western Poetry League.*

May 16th issue of UNITY will be a CLARENCE DARROW MEMORIAL

—

Orders should be placed in advance for extra copies.